

RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR 1.116  
EXPEDITED PROCEDURE  
EXAMINING GROUP 260

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Levine

Serial No.: 08/005,727

Group No.: 2602

Filed: January 19, 1993

Examiner: Flynn

For: TELEVISION SYSTEM MODULE WITH REMOTE CONTROL CODE  
DETERMINATION

REPLY

Box AF  
Hon. Commissioner of Patents  
and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

In response to the Advisory Action dated March 17, 1994 and pursuant to a telephone conversation with Examiner Flynn on April 13, 1994, the Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 of the present application, which stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Rumbolt et al should be held allowable over this reference. First, the issue of operator intervention has been addressed previously, in the Office Action mailed August 20, 1993 (Paper No. 3) resulting in an amendment of claim 11 dated November 19, 1993. In order to overcome the Examiner's rejection on the grounds that "analyzing" could include an analysis by an operator, which would bring it within the teachings of Rumbolt, the Applicant included the limitation of "electronically" analyzing the resulting operation. Since it was deemed that electronic analysis might possibly fall within the

